

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for carefully reviewing the present application. The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 02, 2005 regarding claims 1-20. The applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over cited references.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9 and 13 are amended, and claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. These amendments contain no new matter.

Specification and Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the reference number of the element "outer side piece" in Page 10, Line 10 of the specification, and the element "outer side piece" is designated as reference number 256.

Applicant has amended the term "inner fixed piece" of the lower side plate in claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 as the term "inner side piece" for clarity and consistency.

These amendment contains no new matter nor raises new issues.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm (U.S. Pat. No. 2,284,815) in view of Montgomery (U.S. Pat. No. 6,708,874). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that Grimm in combination with Montgomery do not render the claimed invention obvious, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

As recited in the amended claim 1, the present invention is directed to a portable accessory box, comprising: a bottom plate, wherein the bottom plate comprises a hand-held hole; two side rectangular bodies fixedly connected to two sides of the bottom plate, wherein each of the side rectangular bodies comprises an embedded slot, and the side rectangular bodies are spaced; and a lower side plate fixedly connected to a lower side of the bottom plate, wherein the lower side plate comprises an inner side piece, and the lower side plate is folded upwardly and inwardly to embed the inner side piece into the embedded slot of each of the side rectangular bodies, so as to divide each of the side rectangular bodies into two rectangular sub-bodies and form a lower rectangular body between the side rectangular bodies, and to provide five independent sections including the rectangular

sub-bodies of each side rectangular body and the lower rectangular body for storing accessories.

In the amended claim 1, the side rectangular bodies are spaced out a distance apart, and when the lower side plate is folded upwardly and inwardly to embed the inner side piece into the embedded slot of each side rectangular body, each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies and a lower rectangular body is formed at the space between the side rectangular bodies (exemplified in FIGs. 2 and 3 of the present application). Accordingly, the portable accessory box in the claimed invention provides five independent sections including the rectangular sub-bodies of each side rectangular body and the lower rectangular body for storing accessories.

However, in the package disclosed by Grimm, the two side rectangular bodies are immediately close to each other, and the extensions 16 and 17 of the two side rectangular bodies are in contact, so that there is no space for storing accessories between the side rectangular bodies (FIGs. 2 and 3 in Grimm). Further, after assembling, the tongue portions 10 and 11 cannot divide each side rectangular body into two independent rectangular sub-bodies (FIG. 5 in Grimm). Therefore, after assembling, the package provides no rectangular body between the side rectangular bodies, and each side rectangular body cannot be divided into two independent sections. As a result, the package disclosed by Grimm only can provide two independent sections for storing accessories. Obviously, Grimm fails

to disclose or teach the technique features of the amended claim 1 of the present application, and the package disclosed by Grimm cannot achieve the effects of the amended claim 1 of the present application.

According to the aforementioned description, Grimm does not teach the technique features recited in the amended claim 1 of the present application relative to that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Montgomery discloses a carton, in which a bottom plate comprises a hand held hole. However, Montgomery also fails to teach the technique features recited in the amended claim 1 including that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Accordingly, Montgomery cannot cure the insufficiency of Grimm. It is believed that the features of amended claim 1 are non-obvious, and amended claim 1 should be allowable.

2. Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Nemoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,970). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm,

Montgomery and Nemoto does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

As recited in the amended claim 7, the side rectangular bodies are spaced out a distance apart, and after the lower side plate is folded upwardly and inwardly to embed the inner side piece into the embedded slot of each side rectangular body, each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies and a lower rectangular body is formed at the space between the side rectangular bodies. Therefore, the portable accessory box in the claimed invention provides five independent sections including the rectangular sub-bodies of each side rectangular body and the lower rectangular body for storing accessories.

Just as argued above, neither Grimm nor Montgomery discloses or teaches the technique features recited in the amended claim 7 of the present application relative to that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Nemoto discloses a cushioning support member, in which a bottom plate (Reference number 22d in FIG. 4 of Nemoto) includes two fixed pieces (39c, 39d), and rectangular bodies (34a-34d) comprises outer, upper, inner, and lower side pieces and further comprises an insertion slot (38). However, Nemoto also fails to teach the technique features recited in

the amended claim 7 including that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Accordingly, Nemoto cannot cure the insufficiency of the combination of Grimm and Montgomery. It is believed that the features of amended claim 7 are non-obvious, and amended claim 7 is allowable.

Since the independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable, the dependent claims 2 and 3 each of which depends from the independent claim 1, and the dependent claim 8 that depends from the independent claim 7, are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Lopez (U.S. Pat. No. 4,511,079). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery and Lopez does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as argued above, since the independent claim 1 is allowable, the dependent claim 4 that depends from the independent claim 1 is

likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Starr (U.S. Pat. No. 4,522,303). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery and Starr does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as argued above, since the independent claim 1 is allowable, the dependent claim 5 that depends from the independent claim 1 is likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Kataoka (U.S. Pat. No. 5,899,336). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery and Kataoka does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be

withdrawn.

Just as argued above, since the independent claim 1 is allowable, the dependent claim 6 that depends from the independent claim 1 is likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery and Nemoto as applied to Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Lopez. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery, Nemoto and Lopez does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as argued above, since the independent claim 7 is allowable, the dependent claim 9 that depends from the independent claim 7 is likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery and Nemoto as applied to Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Starr. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is

respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery, Nemoto and Starr does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Since the independent claim 7 is allowable, the dependent claim 10 that depends from the independent claim 7 is likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

8. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Montgomery and Nemoto as applied to Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Kataoka. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Montgomery, Nemoto and Kataoka does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as argued above, since the independent claim 7 is allowable, the dependent claims 11 and 12 each of which depends from the independent claim 7 are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

9. Claims 13 and 17-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Deline (U.S. Pat. No. 3,018,940). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm and Deline does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

As recited in the amended claim 13, the present invention is directed to a portable accessory box, comprising: a bottom plate; two side rectangular bodies fixedly connected to two sides of the bottom plate, wherein each of the side rectangular bodies comprises an embedded slot, and the side rectangular bodies are spaced; a lower side plate fixedly connected to a lower side of the bottom plate, wherein the lower side plate comprises an inner side piece, and the lower side plate is folded upwardly and inwardly to embed the inner side piece of the lower side plate into the embedded slot of each of the side rectangular bodies, so as to divide each of the side rectangular bodies into two rectangular sub-bodies and form a lower rectangular body between the side rectangular bodies; and an upper side plate fixedly connected to an upper side of the bottom plate. The upper side plate comprises: an inner side piece, wherein the upper side plate is folded downwardly and inwardly to embed the inner side piece into the embedded slot of each of the side rectangular bodies, so as to form an upper rectangular body between the side rectangular bodies, and six

independent sections including the rectangular sub-bodies of each side rectangular body, the lower rectangular body and the upper rectangular body are provided for storing accessories; and an outer side piece, wherein the outer side piece comprises a hand-hole for carrying the portable accessory box.

In the amended claim 13, the side rectangular bodies are spaced out a distance apart, and after the lower side plate and the upper side plate are folded to embed the inner side pieces of the lower and upper side plates into the embedded slot of each side rectangular body, each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies and a lower rectangular body and an upper rectangular body are formed at the space between the side rectangular bodies (embodied in FIGs. 5-7 of the present application). Accordingly, the portable accessory box in the claimed invention provides six independent sections including the rectangular sub-bodies of each side rectangular body, the lower rectangular body and the upper rectangular body for storing accessories.

However, in the package disclosed by Grimm, the tongue portions 10 and 11 cannot divide each side rectangular body into two independent sections (FIG. 5 in Grimm), and the package provides no rectangular body between the side rectangular bodies. As a result, the package disclosed by Grimm only can provide two independent sections for storing accessories. It is believed that Grimm fails to disclose or teach the features of amended claim 13 of the present

application, and the package disclosed by Grimm cannot achieve the effects of amended claim 13 of the present application.

According to the aforementioned description, Grimm does not teach the technique features recited in the amended claim 13 of the present application including that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Deline discloses a carton, in which an upper side plate (Reference Number 15 in FIG. 1 of Deline) comprising a hand hole. However, Deline also fails to teach the features recited in the amended claim 13 including that each side rectangular body is divided into two rectangular sub-bodies, a lower rectangular body is formed between the side rectangular bodies, and five independent sections are provided in the portable accessory box. Accordingly, Deline cannot cure the insufficiency of Grimm. It is believed that the technology features of the amended claim 13 are non-obvious, and the amended claim 13 is allowable.

Since the independent claim 13 is allowable, the dependent claims 17-20 each of which depends from the independent claim 13 are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

10. Claims 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimm in view of Deline as applied to Claims 13 and 17-20 above, and further in view of Nemoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grimm, Deline and Nemoto does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as the aforementioned description, since the independent claim 13 is allowable, the dependent claims 14, 15 and 16 each of which depends from the independent claim 13 are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 as currently presented are in condition for allowance and hereby requests reconsideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

(717) 426-1664

RABIN & BERDO. P.C.

(202)371-8976

Customer No. 23995